

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated April 24, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections of claims 6-11. The withdrawal of the previous grounds of rejection is noted with appreciation.

35 USC § 101:

Claims 10 and 11 have been rejected as allegedly not being directed to statutory subject matter.

With regard to claim 10, the Examiner incorrectly states that the claim is directed to computer program steps. However, claim 10 is not specifically directed to computer program steps. It is claimed as a method, which is authorized by 35 USC 101. Since the method of claim 10 produces a useful result, i.e., scaled images, the claim is directed to statutory subject matter. Compare to the claim allowed in *State Street Bank*.

Claim 11 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 10 and 11 now comply with 35 USC 101. In the event that any issues remain concerning this subject matter, the Examiner is respectfully urged to contact the undersigned.

Art Rejections:

Claims 6 – 8, 10, and 11 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Kamijo* (JP 10-174052) in view of *Sobue* (USP 5,610,728).

Kamijo's invention is merely a technique for producing thumbnail images. The *Kamijo* reference describes an arrangement for displaying image data of different image sizes as thumbnail images. A reduction scaling factor is determined for each image, using logarithmic and one-dimensional coefficients, based on the size information of the image data. In one mode of *Kamijo*, each image data is reduced by applying the individually determined reduction scaling factor for that item of data, rather than applying a fixed reduction scaling factor. In the second mode, if the differences between the minimum size and the maximum size are below a predetermined threshold, the scaling is done using a predetermined scaling factor.

In the second mode, the predetermined scaling factor cannot **cause the detected maximum size to match with a size of a print area** because (1) *Kamijo* relates to a technique for producing thumbnail images, which is nothing to do with printing, and (2) the predetermined scaling factor is set before the images are even measured.

With regard to claim 6, as recognized by the Examiner, *Kamijo* fails to teach a selecting unit (or step) for selecting a paper size that is equal to or larger than a detected maximum size of the multiple document images. The Examiner attempts to overcome this deficiency with *Sobue*. The Examiner alleges that *Sobue* teaches a forming unit for forming all of said document images of the individual print job on the selected papers. However, as is clear from Fig. 5 and column 6, lines 14 – 35, *Sobue* determines individually, for each image, what size paper the image should be printed on.

Claim 6, as now amended recites a selecting unit for selecting a paper size that is equal to or larger than the detected maximum size; and a forming unit for forming all of said multiple document images of said individual print job on papers of the selected paper size. Thus, in claim 6, all of the images are formed on the same size paper. Accordingly, claim 6 is allowable over the applied art.

Claim 7, as now amended, recites a calculating unit for calculating a scaling factor that **causes the detected maximum size to match with a size of a print area**; and a processing unit for scaling up or down the sizes of all of the multiple document images of said individual print job by **the** calculated scaling factor. Thus, all of the images are scaled by the same scaling factor. As set forth above, in one mode of *Kamijo*, each image data is reduced by applying the individually determined reduction scaling factor for that item of data, rather than applying a fixed reduction scaling factor. In the other mode, if the differences between the minimum size and the maximum size are below a predetermined threshold, the scaling is done using a predetermined scaling factor. In the second mode, the predetermined scaling factor cannot **cause the detected maximum size to match with a size of a print area** because the predetermined scaling factor is set before the images are even measured. Accordingly, *Kamijo* does not teach or suggest the claimed combination that includes scaling up or down the sizes of all of the multiple document images of said individual print job to **cause the detected maximum size to match with a size**

of a print area by the same, i.e., calculated, scaling factor. Therefore, claim 7 is also allowable over the applied art.

Claims 8 – 11 are also allowable at least for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 7.


Further, the new claims 17 through 20 and 21 through 24 are now presented, which include similar limitations set forth above regarding claim 6 and claim 7, respectively; therefore these new claims are also allowable at least for the reasons set forth above regarding claim 6 and 7, respectively.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections. In the event that there are any questions concerning this amendment, or the application in general, the Examiner is urged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: 10-23-2007

By: 
William C. Rowland
Registration No. 30,888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620